

## **MA TRANSPORTATION AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE**

### **Issues and Proposed Solutions**

#### **Minutes from July 9, 2003 Meeting**

##### Members Present via Conference Call:

Bob Macaux, Florence County  
Sue Torum, Jefferson County  
Tammy Pinno, Fond du Lac  
Deb Rathermel, Fond du Lac  
Joanne Simpson, DHFS  
Eileen McRae, DHFS  
Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

##### Members Absent

Liz Green, Dane County  
Barb Spaude, Outagamie  
Joyce Decker, Winnebago

1. DHFS had forwarded a copy of the MA Handbook sections related to transportation to members prior to the call. There was some discussion at the beginning of the meeting about distribution of materials. Some agencies had indicated that they hadn't seen the new handbook material before, although the release was in April. There are numerous methods for communicating policies and procedures – IM manual, MA handbook, FS Handbook, Ops Memos and Admin Memos. It is difficult for agencies to manage all of these communications. In addition, there are outside agencies such as the Aging Units that administer transportation services and agencies need to ensure that these agencies have the same information.  
ACTION ITEM: DHFS members agreed to provide this information to the communications section in DHFS.
2. The Workgroup began discussing the items in the attached table. The first 3 items were discussed and notes about the discussion are shown in the table.
3. Next Steps: At the next meeting (soon to be scheduled), the Workgroup will discuss the remaining items in the table. All recommendations will then be compiled and forwarded to the IMAC Committee and to DHFS management.

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
1. Workload	Propose to eliminate prior authorization for transportation services	Reduces workload for agencies	Increase in appeals and shift of workload to state; Loss of ability to determine if client is taking the least expensive form of transportation (city bus vs. taxi)	OK to do 3 to 6 month approvals for a particular purpose e.g. pregnancy.
	<b>JULY 9, 2003 MEETING:</b> <b>Proposal to specify that if the client is taking his/her own vehicle or a city bus, prior authorization is not needed. If the client wishes to take a taxi or form of transportation other than his/her own vehicle or city bus, prior authorization is needed.</b> <b>As always, the county needs to be able to document that the trip took place for an MA covered service</b>	Reduces workload for agencies	Addresses the need to ensure that the client is taking the least expensive form of available transportation	<b>The Workgroup agreed to forward this proposal to IMAC and DHFS management.</b>  <b>This may require an administrative rule change.</b>  <b>In terms of documenting that a trip took place, there are various ways to do this. For example, some counties have a form the client takes to the provider for signature.</b>

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
2. Workload	Verify mileage through claims system	Reduces agency workload	a. Reimbursement delayed when claim is not submitted timely. This will increase calls and workload. If in managed care, we don't get those claims and again an increase in work for the state.	<b>JULY 9, 2003 WORKGROUP MEETING:</b> <b>The Workgroup decided that the MA Handbook currently gives them the authority to deny claims for unreasonable mileage. This is not an issue that we need a recommendation on.</b> <b>Therefore, no recommendation will be forwarded to IMAC or DHFS managers on this item.</b>

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
3. Workload and adequacy of admin fee for counties.	Centralize the system – transportation broker option. So, authorization, verification and reimbursement would be provided centrally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Transportation for MA takes the burden off volunteer vans which are then freed up to serve other people/demands for rides.</li> <li>b. Reduces workload for local and state.</li> <li>c. Could decrease client confusion because they only have to call one number</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Transportation for MA takes the burden off volunteer vans which are then freed up to serve other people/demands for rides. If taken from county, this control is taken away too.</li> <li>b. Concern that providers will no longer work cooperatively with the county</li> </ul> <p><b><u>From July 9, 2003 Meeting:</u></b> The biggest con is the fear that people will be lost in the shuffle if they are not working with someone locally.</p>	<p>Concern raised about family care counties. It is a risk-based system and transportation is part of the benefit package —providers at risk if they don't ensure it is provided. Also, need to be careful about what the authorization process might look like.</p> <p><b><u>FROM JULY 9, 2003 MEETING:</u></b>  <b>Prior Authorization is the biggest workload issue. The need for a centralized system is lessened if the prior authorization issue is addressed. However, agencies are open to looking at new ways of doing business.</b>  <b>If a centralization proposal is considered by DHFS, the Workgroup would like to be involved in this effort. The workgroup identified the need to think about the impact on transportation providers getting reimbursed timely under a centralized system.</b></p>

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
4. Workload	SSI Recipients – budget proposal for HMO providers – include transportation in services	a. This would be a significant workload saving for local agencies.	Same as #3 above but smaller population. May be confusing for client in families where one person is on SSI and the other on MA	Workgroup re: SSI in managed care provision in budget. This item can be discussed with the SSI workgroup
5. Inconsistent Policy and Workload –	Statewide guidance on who is eligible for transportation services	Everyone on MA is eligible for transportation with two exceptions. The exceptions are for Ambulance and SMV.		DHFS will clarify in the next MA handbook
6. Inconsistent Policy –	Issue on meal reimbursement. Attachment was provided prior to the July 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting, plus current handbook.			DHFS proposes either the State rate or County rate. The agency can choose and should adopt a written policy
7. Inconsistent Policy.	Statewide guidelines needed to clarify who, what where why when how. Does 5 and 6 take care of these issues? See new MA release in MA handbook			May be beneficial to some counties but others may want more flexibility; Concern about what rules allow us to do. Smaller county concern.
8. Adequacy of Reimbursement fee for counties	DHFS has requested a small increase for common carrier administrative expenses			The Legislature has removed this provision

Other items/comments:

1. We should consider bringing in MA providers – what guidelines do they need and how do they view any of the options?
2. The number of providers did not seem to be a major issue. Bigger transportation issues centered on getting to work, or getting discharged from the hospital on a Sunday.
3. A separate issue has arisen. Do the local agencies feel they need guidelines on a deadline to submit mileage records? One county has a client that has recently submitted bills that are 2-3 years old. We would like to allow flexibility, but it might be good to have a specific timeframe.

4. We should e-mail the IM agency directors to announce the ad hoc committee to ensure we have adequate representation and to communicate that we want input as well as representation from local agencies. **UPDATE – A REQUEST FOR INPUT WAS PUT FORTH IN ADMINISTRATOR’S MEMO ON IMAC.**